

**Steering Committee Minutes
July 26, 2008**

Steering Committee Members

C.T. Davis	Bonsall
Margarette Morgan	Bonsall
Judy Haldeman	Borrego Springs
Bev Esry	Campo/Lake Morena
Jack Vandover	Crest/Dehesa/Harbison Canyon/ Granite Hills
Harry Christianson	Fallbrook
James Russell	Fallbrook
Shirley Fisher	Jacumba
Dan Neirinckx	Jamul/Dulzura
Linda Ivy	Jamul/Dulzura
Jack Shelver	Julian
Vern Denham	Pine Valley
Carl Meyer	Potrero
Rua Petty	Rainbow
Helene Radzik	Ramona
Lois Jones	San Dieguito
Lora Lowes	Spring Valley
Gil Jemmott	Twin Oaks
Jack Phillips	Valle de Oro
Oliver Smith	Valley Center

Planning Commission

Bryan Woods, Planning Commissioner

Staff

Devon Muto, Chief
Bob Citrano, DPLU Staff
Eric Lardy, DPLU Staff
Jimmy Wong, DPLU Staff
Christine Wang, DPLU Staff

Public

Charlene Ayers	Ranters Roost
Sachiko Kohatsu	Board of Supervisors District Three
Jake Christie	East County Californian
William Crawley	Potrero CPG Member

Meeting Commenced at 9:07 a.m.

I. Introductions

Mr. Woods called the meeting to order, and the group went around the table and introduced themselves. He opened the floor for any questions and Ms. Esry asked she should encourage her community members to attend the Community Plan Templates Workshops. Mr. Woods commented that it depends on the group, adding that community members may not be able to partake in the meeting until public comment. Mr. Muto added that there will be limited time with the large amount of information to cover.

Mr. Petty asked if Public Comment could be at the beginning of the meeting, Mr. Woods agreed and opened the floor to non-agenda items. Mr. Petty asked that the group discuss recent events in Valley Center, adding that he feels the Steering Committee should put on the agenda to voice that it felt the circumstances were inappropriate. Mr. Woods noted that this action would be treading new ground, and asked Mr. Muto to explain the events Mr. Petty referred to with regard to the Valley Center Specific Plan Area and Road 3a. There was a brief description by Mr. Muto and Mr. O. Smith, and after discussion with the group it was decided that each Community Planning and Sponsor Group should send a letter to the Board of Supervisors if they feel it is appropriate.

II. **Action Item:** Approve minutes from June 28, 2008 Steering Committee Meeting.

Phillips: Move Approval
Petty: Second

Mr. Meyer noted that the PBS&J staff that attended were not listed. Mr. Woods informed him that would be corrected.

Motion Passes 15-0-2

III. Comments on Draft Land Use Element (Continued)

Mr. Woods informed the group that essentially staff has looked at each of the comments submitted and agreed with them, and has listed 9 issues in this handouts that they would like more input. He informed the group that staff would like to get comments from the group on a definition of Community Character.

Mr. Phillips stated that this method is avoiding a Steering Committee Position on the Land Use Element, and noted last time he saw problems when Staff interpreted the Steering Committee's comments. He expressed his opinion that there needs to be votes on these issues, and asked that review start from page 1.

Mr. Woods commented that his take on the draft Land Use Element is different, and thinks staff should make a strikeout version of the document to show the Steering Committee what has changed. He added that he feels the other method will take many meetings. Mr. Phillips commented that the review by the Steering Committee will not take a long time.

Mr. Muto noted that the Interest Group was created by the Board of Supervisors with equal authority, and that there are two committees that have to be addressed. Mr. Woods added that at a point in the process it has to be put into one document.

Mr. Phillips commented that the document should be put in front of the Board of Supervisors, who will need to listen to the Steering Committee or Interest Group.

Mr. Russell commented that the committee should stop spending so much time of the meetings discussing the format of the meeting. He asked to get into the document.

Mr. Muto added that the document is not going to have a vast re-write, and that we will incorporate the comments.

Ms. Morgan commented that she thinks it would be supportive to have the Steering Committee have separate comments. Mr. Woods noted that another option is to have the Steering Committee comment on the final document.

Ms. Jones stated that the problem with that is the elected bodies do not have a definitive voice, and noted that the Board of Supervisors may not read every item in the General Plan. She commented that this method puts the onus on the Steering Committee's shoulders to prove it, and that she thinks the Board of Supervisors will side with the Steering Committee in the end.

Mr. Phillips commented that if staff proceeds in this manner his Planning Group will actively oppose what the County is doing with the General Plan Update for silencing the voice of the elected committee.

Mr. Woods commented that he feels that is not what is occurring. Mr. Muto stated that the comments that have not had obvious conflict have been put directly into the document, and that we would like to discuss those other items. He added that the one situation where there was obvious conflict in the pervious version there was a note that the Steering Committee option was different.

Morgan: Motion to have a Steering Committee Position Document for the Land Use Element.

Radzik: Second

Mr. Russell noted that Mr. Muto was referring to Page LU-15 on how he could show that the Steering Committee Position in the Land Use Element.

Mr. O. Smith commented that the group would like to have a position, and that it would require dividing the document into three columns that show the Steering Committee Position, Interest Group Position and Staff Position. He added that it would bring the process into the open.

Morgan: Restated motion to specify the use of the format from two years ago, having a Steering Committee, Interest Group and Staff column in a single document.

Radzik: Second Agrees

Motion Passes 17-0-0

Definition of Community Character

Mr. Woods stated that as we were saying earlier, PBS&J is writing a general Community Character Statement for the County of San Diego.

Mr. Phillips commented that the consultant description should not conflict in any way with the community plan statement. Mr. Muto commented that the idea is to have a general description of what makes up Community Character, then refer to the Community Plan descriptions.

Mr. O. Smith stated that he thinks we need to understand what the community character is, that he thinks “against the community character” is a useless statement unless specifics are given.

Mr. Denham explained that in Pine Valley there are houses are tucked under trees on large lots, and if a developer comes in wanting to develop a meadow then it is not in line with the Pine Valley Community Character. Mr. O. Smith stated that there are specifics involved in that definition.

Mr. Muto commented that specifics can be discussed in the workshops, and Mr. Russell suggested that the consultant read the Community Character Statements.

Mr. Phillips commented that he has successfully argued that projects are against the Valle De Oro Community Character, and that the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors consider it. Mr. Woods added that the Planning Commission takes it into account.

Mr. Meyer commented that there should be some discussion of the region, including the relationship between the cities, and county. He noted that this could relate to keeping more development in the cities. Ms. Radzik agreed that there should be some discussion of regional perspective.

Ms. Morgan commented that that is SANDAG’s responsibility, and Ms. Radzik responded that that is a problem because SANDAG has designated Ramona a Smart Growth Community, adding that Ramona does not approve of the designation.

Density-bonus exemption for groundwater dependant areas

Mr. Woods asked the group to look at the next discussion item, density bonus exception on groundwater dependant areas. Mr. Muto explained that there are items in state law that requires local governments to implement programs related to affordable housing. He noted that there were a number of comments that we would like to sponsor legislation that exempts groundwater dependant areas from affordable housing density bonuses.

Mr. Russell commented that he certainly would like this sponsored, and that they had one in Fallbrook that he would certainly not want to see again.

Russell: Motion to support sponsoring legislation to exempt groundwater dependant and rural areas from density bonus requirements.

Petty: Second

Motion Passes 17-0-0

Mr. Muto noted that our support will be most effective if we start doing it now. Mr. Woods added that staff will contact the County Department of Strategy and Intergovernmental Affairs and author a letter to be sent from the Committee to the Board of Supervisors.

Ms. Morgan commented that if Mr. Muto outlines a letter she would be happy to draft it, adding that water officials come to Bonsall to speak about restricting water, a concern of hers.

Mr. Russell explained that one of his problems with the legislation is that it waives development requirements as part of it.

Location of Medium and High Impact Industrial Uses

Mr. Muto asked that the group discuss the Location of High and Medium Industrial Lands, adding that it has been discussed before when there were concerns with locating them in rural areas. He added that the reason they were not included as compatible in the Village is that Village areas are mostly residential and that does not work with housing, but we are looking for comments from the group.

Mr. Petty commented that industrial should be allowed in the town center where people live and jobs should be, adding that it does not belong near farmland. Mr. Woods commented that light industrial is commonly found in villages, not heavy industrial.

Mr. Phillips commented that his community at one time had High, Medium and Light Industrial when Spring Valley was part his planning area. He noted that High Impact Industrial is only compatible with Medium Impact Industrial.

Mr. Woods noted that Alpine, Lakeside and Tecate are not in attendance, the communities which most desire to have industrial lands. There was discussion on delegating the siting of

Industrial Lands to a Major Use Permit, and concerns were raised that industrial lands in groundwater dependant areas would impact groundwater.

Mr. Phillips explained the position in of the Valle De Oro CPG in their letter with suggested edits to Page LU-11 and LU-25. Mr. Muto explained that he has a concern is that the Land Use Element must be consistent with the Land Use Map.

Phillips: Motion to incorporate Valle De Oro Comments for Page LU-11, 3rd Paragraph and LU-25 1st Paragraph Last Sentence.

LU-11, 3rd Paragraph – Delete “In Semi-Rural and Rural Areas” from the first sentence and rewrite the forth sentence as follows, “Therefore, this designation ~~is generally~~ may be incompatible with most Village areas”.

LU-25, 1st Paragraph – Replace the last sentence with the following: “High Impact Industrial uses are not compatible with other uses except Medium Impact Industrial. They must be isolated from residential and commercial designations and adequately screened and buffered to eliminate unacceptable off-site impacts.”

Morgan: Second

Mr. Muto stated that staff can add more language about locating new industrial uses and how they should be measured. Ms. Radzik asked how uses like a chicken coup will be located, Mr. Muto replied that it will be an agriculture uses and that some will still be allowed with the proper permits outside agricultural areas. Mr. Radzik also noted that TIF fees make it difficult to put in industrial uses. Mr. Woods noted that the TIF fees are a separate discussion.

Mr. Morgan suggested adding language that includes consideration for water, roads and appropriate infrastructure. Mr. Muto agreed that this could be added.

Ms. Lowes commented that she would like the motion to retain “generally incompatible” in Villages.

Motion Passes 16-1-0

There was a break at 10:43 and Mr. Woods called the meeting back to order at 10:54.

Semi-Rural Residential 0.5 designation

Mr. Muto explained that the Semi-Rural 0.5 designation was created out of the VR-2 designation, allowing some areas at that density to be put into the Semi-Rural regional category in areas that are currently built at that density. He added that currently they are shown on the map as the same density, and they are allowed in either regional category.

Mr. Russell commented that he thinks this designation is not appropriate in the semi-rural category if it is not slope dependant.

Russell: Motion to take SR-0.5 designation out of the Semi-Rural Regional Category
Morgan: Second

Mr. Phillips commented that there are several issues that make this important to his community. He noted that much of the Mount Helix residential area is half acre and larger parcels, and that his community does not want it to be in the Village Regional Category. He added that this could make this area see General Plan amendments to higher densities. Additionally he suggested that the SR-0.5 designation remain, be slope dependant and have the qualifier that it must already be built out at that development pattern removed.

Russell: Withdraw Motion
Morgan: Second Agrees

Russell: Motion to at footnote 2 to category SR-.5, making it a slope dependant category.
O. Smith: Second
Motion Passes 17-0-0

Mr. Phillips added that he would like to see the requirement that the areas with this designation be built-out removed. Mr. Muto informed him that Staff will make the change.

Floor to Area Ratio

Mr. Muto informed the group that Floor to Area Ratio (FAR) is suggested by the state to be part of the General Plan, and we want to discuss including or excluding it. He noted that one option is that we can remove the discussion of FAR in the General Plan.

Mr. Woods commented that he think this is the strongest tool we have for your community character to remain as it is now. Mr. Russell asked for a quick description of FAR, Mr. Muto explained that FAR is a component of limiting development on a certain property, in conjunction with setbacks, lot coverage requirements, parking and other requirements. He explained that potentially with a .5 FAR you can cover half the lot with a one story building.

Ms. Lowes asked if FAR eliminates setback requirements and Mr. Muto explained they do not.

Mr. Shelver asked for discussion on how this concept relates to Julian and if it will be appropriate in the historic district. He noted that they are attempting to emulate 1890s to 1910 and it may be appropriate in some areas to allow 80% coverage on a small lot. Mr. Muto referred him to the footnote 4, and asked for comments from the group

There was discussion on the legality of having the FAR be made less restrictive in the Community Plans with exceptions. Mr. Jemmot asked if these could be used in agricultural areas to limit buildings such as the by-right mushroom farm in Twin Oaks, Mr. Muto responded that this could be addressed in the Twin Oaks Valley Community Plan.

Concerns were raised that FAR seems urban, and that if a maximum FAR is put into the General Plan then it will be seen as a goal.

Mr. Muto stated that staff will look into the FAR, and the footnote exception and get back to the Steering Committee.

Policy, LU-1.8

Mr. Woods asked that we move on to the next topic, and Mr. Muto explained that policy LU-1.8 was designed as a way to have a little more flexibility into subdivisions.

There was discussion that this might be helpful to design a project more evenly on a small scale, but that it is not appropriate on many projects with a large scale. Mr. Phillips commented that it needs a Major Use Permit, with protection for the Community Planning and Sponsor Group up to the Board of Supervisors.

Russell: Motion to require a Major Use Permit to implement this policy

Morgan: Second

Motion Passes 15-2-0

Policy LU-2.12

Mr. Muto commented that there were a few comments of concern with this policy. Ms Ivy asked if we are limiting ourselves by requiring open space to be contiguous, Mr. Muto replied that we would like open spaces to be contiguous.

There were comments that this gives some communities heartburn because it can be a takings with the Multiple Species Conservation Plan (MSCP), and that properties surrounded by open space would be effected.

Mr. Muto suggested removing the word require

Esry: Motion to change “Require” to “Encourage” in Policy LU-2.12.

Russell: Second

Motion Passes: 15-2-0

Policy LU-2.15.

Mr. Muto explained that this policy allows clustering, adding that it is advocated by the farm bureau.

There were concerns raised from the Committee that land should be preserved in perpetuity, and that development next to agriculture conflicts with the existing agriculture.

Mr. Woods stated that the Farm Bureau position is that without the land value the farmers can not borrow against the land. Mr. Russell commented that this is a form of compensation after rezoning the farmers with the General Plan Update.

Mr. Muto explained that staff will look into putting in text that applies to existing agriculture.

Mr. Woods asked if there are any other questions or discussion items. Ms Radzik asked about the situation in Ramona that has land being purchased into open space and its effect on the population model. Mr. Muto informed her that once we receive all the information that we will discuss the numbers and look at amending the population model.

Mr. Muto asked the group to remember that the General Plan is always in flux and before it goes to the Board of Supervisors we will ensure up-to date information goes to the Board.

Mr. Russell asked for clarification on the template and how it will be applied to the communities that already have draft Community Plans. Mr. Muto commented that we will look into the Fallbrook, Valle De Oro and Bonsall Community Plans, but that ideally we would like them all put into the template.

Ms. Jones asked if the workshops are primarily for format, Mr. Muto clarified that the workshops are also for content and explaining that there are certain things that can be put into the Community Plan that will help staff develop zoning and other regulations that properly interpret what a Community would like to see.

IV. Public Comment

Mr. Woods asked for Public Comment, and there was none.

V. Next Steps

Mr. Woods informed the group that a meeting would be held in about a month, and announcements would be sent out.

Meeting Adjourned 12:11